LABOR POWER

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST UNION PARTY

Volume 1 | DECEMBER, 1939 | Number 8

S.U.P. HUMBLES TROTSKYITES IN DEBATE

Fallacies of Proletarian Dictatorship Exposed

STALIN "FREES" THE FINNS

THE PAUPERIZATION OF AMERICA

A REPLY TO A STALIN APOLOGIST

CLEVELAND RELIEF WORKERS STARVE

DE LEONISM AND AMERICAN LABOR (I)

ORGANIZATION NOTES

Published by the Socialist Union Party,
1301 Boston Road, New York, N. Y.

PRICE 5 CENTS

ORGANIZATION NOTES

BRANCH NEW YORK

The end of the outdoor season was the signal for the inauguration of Branch New York's Sunday evening forum meetings. Despite the depletion in the ranks of Party speakers, due to the absence from New York of four of our best representatives, the organizer has planned a schedule of interesting evenings. In addition to lectures by S.U.P. and guest speakers, invitations have been issued to various organizations speaking in the name of the working class to participate in a symposium on "The Workers' Attitude Toward the Present War" to be held late in December.

The first two lectures of the current series were delivered by Wendelin Thomas, former Communist member of the Reichstag following the German Revolution of 1918, and at present a writer in New York. Comrade Thomas spoke on the subject "From Weimar to Hitler" and in two exceedingly instructive sessions traced the main outlines of German economic, social and political development after the war to its denouement in the victory of Fascism.

Thomas showed how all of the so-called workers' parties in the Germany successively betrayed their class either by their actions or by their failure to act when conditions were ripe for proletarian revolution. He attributed Hitler's success in winning over huge sections of the German people to the fact that the Nazi chieftain was able to capitalize on the terrific burdens placed upon Germany by the victorious Allies at Versailles and to arouse a militant nationalist spirit which the weak and sometimes cowardly programs of the workers' parties could not overcome.

The audience at both talks was fair in size, but it is expected that as more publicity about the series is spread, we will soon have the hall filled to capacity regularly. The next scheduled speaker is Comrade Herbert Brandon, whose talk on "The State, Socialism and Dictatorship" will deal with a subject deeply agitating advanced workers at this time.

United Front Fails

With the beginning of the war crisis, Branch New York became active in attempting to form a united front with other working class groups to agitate and propagandize against the war plans of the Roosevelt administration. A call for such a united front was initiated by the National Executive Committee toward the end of September. Discovering that similar moves had been made simultaneously by other working class groups, the S.U.P. decided to work within one united front which was already functioning to some extent. This was composed of some six or seven Leninist splinter groups whose total New York membership probably did not exceed that of Branch New York.

Whatever small chance existed that this united front could grow and become effective in rousing workers to the danger facing them from the moves of Roosevelt was soon killed by the unprincipled conduct of some of the participating groups. After having drawn up a leaflet and arranged for an outdoor meeting a few days before Election Day, one group of schoolboys parading under a highly-revolutionary-sounding name withdrew on the totally false pretext that the leaflet jointly agreed upon had been altered without its knowledge.

Just before the outdoor meeting, it was agreed that immediately following it the participating organizations would meet again to discuss their basic program and concrete steps to put it into effect. At the outdoor meeting, which attracted a fair crowd and which might be termed moderately successful, all the groups were represented, either by speakers or by committees. Immediately after this, however, the united front collapsed.

After three attempts to get the delegates together, the S.U.P. received a joint letter from three of the groups withdrawing from the united front on the ground that since their organizations disagreed with the others on the question of whether Russia is a workers' state, they felt that it was impossible to work together in a

(*Continued on page* 18)

LABOR POWER
Published Monthly by the
SOCIALIST UNION PARTY
1301 Boston Road
NEW YORK, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD
B. Robbins, A. Levine, F. Pierson

Subscription: — Per Year, 50c; Semi-Annually, 25c; Single Copy, 5c.
Composed & Printed by Voluntary Labor

Vol. 1, No. 8 December, 1939

Editorials . . .

THE INVASION OF FINLAND AND THE AFTERMATH

With the bombing of Helsinki and other Finnish towns by Red Army planes and the invasion of Finland by Soviet troops, Stalin's old policy of political adventurism has entered into a new phase. Having abandoned the working class years ago, Stalin has pursued a course this year which must succeed in making his name the most hated by-word in the international proletarian movement. First came his alliance with Hitler, butcher of the German working class, on August 23rd. Next came the division of Poland with Germany, with the most important slice going to Hitler. Finally Stalin has chosen to invade one of Europe's smallest countries on the flimsiest and most nonsensical of excuses—that Finland was preparing for war against a nation many times its size!

Is there any rational explanation for this invasion? Only one—that Stalin is preparing against a concerted attack on the Soviet Union by the rest of Europe. But if that is the case, then he has chosen the most unfortunate way of defending the Soviet Union conceivable. For his attack on a practically defenseless nation has alienated the last vestige of working class support which the Soviet Union might have counted on, even despite Stalin's betrayals of the past. If now the bourgeois nations decide to strike against the Soviet Union, who will rally to its support outside of Nazi Germany and the Stalinist stooges throughout the world?

The bourgeoisie will undoubtedly attempt to exploit Stalin's infamous invasion by organizing internationally against the Soviet Union. Already Finland has moved to have the League of Nations defend her; that same League of Nations which was too cowardly to take a single step against Italy or Germany when they invaded smaller nations, or when they aided the Spanish Fascist Franco to power. It is expected that the League will expel Russia if the Red Army does not halt its invasion of Finland. After that, the long-expected attack on the remnants of the Bolshevik Revolution may soon be launched.

The idiotic idea of setting up a puppet Finnish government favorable to Stalin failed to raise more than a cry of derision from the people of Finland, but meanwhile the Finnish workers have been driven into the arms of their worst enemies, their own ruling class, by this tactic. Forgetting the necessity of independent action against their exploiters, the workers are fighting patriotically for their "fatherland." Thus has Stalin aided the reaction to victory in Finland. If the Soviet troops now succeed in subduing the Finns and establishing the puppets in power, they will have installed a regime against which the workers will struggle until it is overthrown.

The bourgeois press continues its attempts to confuse workers by charging that Stalin's moves are designed to "spread Communism" throughout the world. We of the working class movement who have been seeking to establish Communism or Socialism know that this is the vilest slander against our movement. For Communism cannot be imposed by force of arms upon an unwilling people. Communism or Socialism represents the rising of the majority against the miseries caused by rotting capitalism. Stalin's moves represent the attempt to extend his own power over the masses of other countries; he seeks not to liberate, but to chain them with the same bonds which now hold the

Russian masses. Since Communism does not exist in Russia, Stalin is not "spreading Communism."

That the Socialist and Labor movement throughout the world has received a tremendous setback by Stalin's moves cannot be denied. The reaction everywhere is on the march. The same hypocritical politicians who failed to say a word while Italy was invading Ethiopia and Albania, while Germany was taking over Austria and Czechoslovakia are now howling to the skies that American diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union be broken—and they are aided by the fact that the working class has turned away, revolted by the spectacle of a so-called Workers' Government countenancing actions which it had always denounced in the past.

But betrayed by Stalin or not, the working class movement must still face and conquer its enemies, national and international. The main problem for the American workers still remains as before: to overthrow the American capitalist class and establish their unions as the administrative organs of the new society to carry on production for the benefit of the many instead of the few. The workers must approach this task more resolutely than before, determined that a new workers' regime shall be ruled in truth by themselves and not by a bureaucracy of a minority party.

Meanwhile, the workers must resist all attempts of the capitalist class to blind or confuse them into a false "national unity" under cover of which the workers would be sent once more as cannon fodder to settle American capitalism's quarrels with its rivals. Nor can they permit the United States to "gang up" with other nations against the Russian masses who have been betrayed by Stalin just as the international proletariat has been.

The watchword of the working class movement in this critical period must be: SOLIDARITY AND INDEPENDENT ACTION AGAINST ALL OF LABOR'S ENEMIES!

THE RELIEF CRISIS IN CLEVELAND

Mayor Burton's announcement, on November 28th that 12,000 cases had been dropped from the relief rolls of the city of Cleveland brought to a climax the crisis among the aged and unemployed in Ohio. For the 16,000 people represented by these cases the order meant nothing short of starvation since the vast majority are physically incapable of obtaining work even were it available, and their resources were long since exhausted before they could obtain relief. The remaining 45,000 persons on relief had their food orders cut by one-third.

Appeals to Governor Bricker of Ohio to call a session of the legislature to appropriate additional funds were denied by the reactionary representative of capitalism, who stated that Cleveland could and should get the money for relief from its own citizens.

Peculiarly enough, at the very moment when Cleveland and its sister city of Toledo were both proclaiming their inability to supply either relief or jobs to their employed, these industrial cities were enjoying a business boom occasioned by war orders to the factories. Yet only a tiny fraction of the unemployed had been absorbed by this capacity production, leaving thousands of workers permanently on the shelf.

The need of these starving workers for the barest necessities has aroused a storm of criticism of Ohio's relief policies from all over the nation, particularly from New Deal sources which seek to discredit the Republican Governor. President Roosevelt immediately took a hand in the matter. Through the Surplus Commodities Corporation tons of foodstuffs, including butter, flour, raisins, and prunes were shipped into Ohio. Approval of a number of new W.P.A. projects is being rushed so that some part of the unemployed will receive jobs.

Yet with all this hullabaloo and publicity, two factors of the most vital importance to the workers and the unemployed are being glossed over or ignored.

1. This crisis in Cleveland is by no means an isolated ocurrence. In the state of New Jersey last year the legislature sat for weeks debating the question of how to raise relief funds and finally "solved"

(*Continued on page* 19)

DE LEONISM AND AMERICAN LABOR (I)

December 14th marks the 87th anniversary of the birth of Daniel De Leon, Socialist pathfinder and foremost American Marxist and revolutionist. The year 1939 also marks the 25th anniversary of his death on May 11th, 1914.

De Leon came to the proletariat, as did Marx and Engels before him, from the ranks of the bourgeoisie. Scion of a wealthy, aristocratic family of slaveholders in Curacao; he was entering upon a brilliant academic career when he was caught in the upsurge of the rising labor movement of the '80's. His interest in the social problems of the day led him to study the works of Marx and Engels and those of the brilliant American ethnologist, Lewis Henry Morgan. In after years De Leon was wont to credit Morgan's monumental work on the social organization of primitive society, "Ancient Society," with having made him a Socialist.

Turning his back on the promising career that was his for the asking, and breaking completely with his bourgeois background, De Leon joined the Socialist Labor Party in 1890. Within a year he had become Editor of the Party's official organ, *The People*, later designated as the *Weekly People* after the establishment in 1890 of the *Daily People,* both of which he continued to edit until just before his death. From 1890 to 1914 the history of the American Socialist and Labor movements is inseparably linked up with the political and economic career of De Leon.

When De Leon joined the S.L.P. it was far from being the American section of the international Socialist movement, let alone being a Marxist organization. The party at that time was predominately German, with its official business conducted in the German language. The membership, which was composed to a large extent of victims of Bismarck's Anti-Socialist laws, had imported not only their language but also their former background and their intellectual reactions to the partiular backward and feudal conditions prevailing in Germany. All this was transplanted to American soil and the Socialist Labor Party became a compound of German Lassalleism and petty bourgeois reformism. Within its ranks were to be found the most heterogenous elements, ranging from orthodox Marxists to Utopian dreamers, from Christian Socialists to philosophical anarchists.

De Leon instinctively realized that a genuine American Socialist movement must have its roots deep in American conditions in order to reach and influence the American workers; that it could not flourish as the result of grafting imported ideas in an alien climate. De Leon set himself the double task of "Americanizing" the S.L.P. and cleaning out the Augean stables of confusion with which the party was beset. He succeeded in accomplishing this Herculean task but only in the face of the most determined opposition from the opportunist and reformist elements in the party. These dissenters, under the leadership of Morris Hillquit, finally split away and formed the Socialist Party.

Though De Leon was above all a man of action, with nothing but contempt for the "mere theorizers" who cluttered up the movement, he was also a Socialist pathfinder who made outstanding contributions to the field of Socialist theory and tactics. Chief among these was his work in the field of reform. It was De Leon who first clearly analyzed and exposed the pernicious nature of modern reform movements and reformers, and the deadly peril they hold for the revolutionary working class of today.

De Leon's views on reformism were largely summarized in his two brilliant lectures, "Reform or Revolution" and "Two Pages From Roman History" which complement each other. In the first of these De Leon laid down the fundamental lines of the present-day revolutionary class struggle:

"Of all the revolutionary epochs, the present draws the sharpest line between conflicting class interests. Hence, the organization of the Revolution of our gene-

ration must be the most uncompromising of any that yet appeared on the stage of history. The program of this revolution consists not in any one detail. It demands the unconditional surrender of the capitalist system and its wage slavery; the total extinction of class rule is its object. Nothing short of that—whether as a first, a temporary, or any other sort of step—can at this late date receive recognition in the camp of modern revolution."

(*To be concluded in the January issue*)

"REVOLUTIONARY" THUNDER OVER THE BRONX

The "revolutionary" influence of Trotskyism over the masses was vividly demonstrated in the recent election for Councilman in the Bronx. The election was conducted by the proportional representation method, where each voter indicates his first, second, third, etc. choices for the office. The Socialist Workers Party called upon Bronx workers to vote for Max Shachtman, editor of the *Socialist Appeal,* as No. 1 and for the candidates of the pro-war American Labor Party as Nos. 2 and 3.

Came Election Day and 2,259 voters cast their ballots for Shachtman as No. 1. A number of scattering write-in ballots were then eliminated, adding 10 more votes to Shachtman's total, but leaving him the lowest of the remaining candidates. Thereupon his ballots were redistributed to the second choices indicated. The results of the redistribution, as reported in the New York *Herald Tribune* were quite illuminating. The 2,259 votes were transferred as follows:

No Second Choice	290
To 2 American Labor Party candidates	577
To 4 Democratic candidates	744
To 1 Republican candidate	57
To 2 Stalinist candidates	250
To 3 Independent candidates	351
Total	2,269

Quite different from the report of the election appearing in the *Socialist Appeal,* it is plain that most of Shachtman's votes were "screwball" ballots, not the votes of serious-minded workers. If those ballots which showed no second choice are added to the ballots which indicated A.L.P. candidates as No. 2, we arrive at a total of 867 or less than 40 per cent. of Shachtman's total, which might be considered to be directly influenced either by the S.W.P. or by a desire to cast a revolutionary or anti-war or workers' protest ballot; the rest were cast by muddle-headed and confused elements. How, by the way, does the *Socialist Appeal* account for the 105 voters who took the trouble to write in the name of Isidor Begun, Stalinist candidate, as No. 2 after having chosen Shachtman as No. 1?

Daniel De Leon

"The only man who has added anything to Socialist theory since Marx and Engels."

—*N. Lenin.*

All workers owe it to themselves to become acquainted with the works of one who is universally conceded to be America's foremost revolutionist and Marxian theoretician. Knowledge is power!

We recommend:—

Reform and Revolution ... 5c
What Means This Strike? ... 5c
Socialist Reconstruction of Society ... 10c
Burning Question of Trades Unionism ... 10c

The following pamphlets, containing the De Leonist position on their respective questions, will be published soon:—

Socialism or Dictatorship? ... 5c
War and the Working Class ... 5c
Fascism or Socialism? ... 5c

Send all orders to: P.O. Box No. 4, Station T, New York, N. Y.

S.U.P. HUMBLES TROTSKYITES IN DEBATE

Fallacies of Proletarian Dictatorship Exposed

(*Special Correspondence*)

MINNEAPOLIS, Nov. 19.—The theoretical bankruptcy ot the Leninist concept of the vanguard political party within the so-called Workers' State was vividly brought out in the course of a debate held Sunday, November 19, 1939 at Minneapolis between the Socialist Union Party and the Socialist Workers Party.

The subject of the debate was: "Resolved, that a Workers' State is necessary to introduce Socialism in the U. S."

Carlos Hudson, leading Trotskyite and former candidate for Mayor, represented the Socialist Workers Party speaking for the affirmative with Abraham Ziegler, National Secretary of the Socialist Union Party speaking in the negative.

Hudson opened up with a 30 minute presentation. He paid tribute to Daniel De Leon as the pioneer Marxist of America and recalled that it was in the city of Minneapolis, but a short distance from the hall in which the present debate was being held, that De Leon delivered his epoch-making, internationally famous address, "Socialist Reconstruction of Society." "The debate this afternoon," dramatically announced Hudson, "is going to be between De Leon's 'Socialist Reconstruction of Society' and Lenin's 'State and Revolution.' "

Instead, however, of hewing close to the line laid down, the S.W.P. representative proceeded to wander far afield, delving into the history of the De Leonist movement down to the formation of the Socialist Party. Just what relevancy this historical dissertation had in connection with the subject matter at hand, any more than the very devious history and antecedents of the Socialist Workers Party, Hudson failed to make clear. The speaker then proceeded to fall afoul of De Leon as one who did not understand Marx, etc., etc., in the best manner of the tribe of De Leon traducers, cataloging the alleged sins and heresies of De Leon, one after another. De Leon did not understand the role of transitional demands. De Leon did not understand the role of the International. He formulated a peculiar form of anti-Marxist exceptionalism for America, etc., etc. By this time members of the audience was beginning to ask themselves whether or not they had drifted into the wrong hall and whether they were attending the right debate. It appeared that De Leon and not the Workers' State was the subject of debate as formulated by Hudson.

Finally the speaker came down to earth and the particular subject matter of the debate.

De Leon was accused of not understanding the nature of the State and the Marxian concept of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. This lack of understanding appeared to consist in the fact that De Leon refused to recognize that a Workers' State would be necessary to suppress the counter-revolutionary activities of the capitalist class after capitalism and the capitalist State had been destroyed.

Having shot off his heavy artillery, Hudson concluded his affirmative presentation with a maze of quotations from Marx and Lenin.

Thereupon, the Chairman introduced Abraham Ziegler, National Secretary of the Socialist Union Party, who spoke 30 minutes in the negative.

At the very outset of his presentation Ziegler called attention to the fact that the subject matter of the debate was not De Leonism in general but the necessity for a Workers' State here in the United States and that he, Ziegler, proposed to hew close to the line thus laid down, and would not be carried away on any side issues that his opponent had raised. If Hudson wanted to debate De Leonism that could very easily be arranged for a proper occasion.

Ziegler proceeded to define a Workers' State, calling attention to the peculiar Leninist concept to which the S.W.P. subscribes, of the vanguard political party

playing the dominant role within such a Workers' State as a power above the workers and their mass organizations.

Conceding that the Marxist tactic of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat had a limited historical validity, Ziegler traced the formulation of this tactic to the backward economic conditions prevailing in Marx's time. Production at that time had not been sufficiently developed to provide material abundance for all. The material basis was thus lacking for the immediate introduction of a classless, Socialist society. This immaturity of the productive forces made necessary a political transtion period, i.e., a Dictatorship of the Proletariat, to bridge over the gap of insufficiency until the necessary high level of production could be attained by society.

Here in the United State, Ziegler pointed out, capitalist production had long since reached a sufficient degree of productivity to make possible abundance for all. Consequently Socialism, a *classless* system of society, could be established immediately without the intervention of a political transition period.

Continuing on, Ziegler pointed out that any attempt to set on foot a so-called Workers' State in the face of the ad vanced economic, social and cultural conditions prevailing in America would constitute a gross and unwarranted usurpation which must necessarily degenerate into a dictatorship over the masses along the pattern of the evil, corrupt Stalinist bureaucracy. He drew upon the historical experience of the Russian Communist Party under the regime of Lenin and Trotsky to drive home this point. Attention was called to the fact that the Leninist concept of the political party playing the "leading and dominant" role in the Workers' State had no basis whatsoever in Marxism but was a purely Leninist innovation.

Finally the S.U.P. representative challenged Hudson to state categorically the precise position the labor unions would occupy under his proposed Workers' State, and whether or not they would be subject to control and domination by the minority Communist Party.

Hudson then made his first rebuttal of 15 minutes.

Instead of attempting to categorically rebut the several points made by his opponent, Hudson completely fled the field of battle. The S.W.P. representative entered the realm of Alice in Blunderland and made the amazing "discovery" that De Leon was not a revolutionist after all, that in fact he was a secret enemy of the proletarian revolution and that was why De Leonites were so bitterly opposed to the concept of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat!

De Leon, so opined Hudson, was no different from Kautsky who also set himself up as a Marxist but in practice actually betrayed the revolution. And the proof for this remarkable concoction? Quite simple. De Leon taught that a peaceful revolution was possible here in the U. S.! Hudson conveniently omitted to state that De Leon qualified this by adding that peaceful revolution was possible only if the workers had organized their economic power along Socialist lines to check the pro-slavery rebellion of the capitalists. According to Hudson, this made De Leon a counter-revolutionist, just like Kautsky.

ATTENTION: MINNEAPOLIS READERS

Free Study Class

The Marxist-De Leonist Study Class and Discussion Group conducted under the auspices of the S.U.P. meets every Tuesday evening at 8 p.m. sharp at I.O.G.T. Hall, 1416 Second Street, Minneapolis.

The class combines a thorough grounding in the principles of Marxian economics and sociology with the practical application of Marxist theory to the problems confronting the working class.

LABOR POWER readers are urged to attend the sessions of this class and to invite their friends, neighbors and fellow workers tc do likewise. There is no fee or obligation for attending.

Before concluding Hudson managed to make one legitimate point. He brought forward the claim that bureaucracy was just as apt to flower in an industrial union administration as under the "leading" role of a minority political party and cited the example of the present-day trade union bureaucracy as proof.

Characteristic of his entire performance, Hudson completely ignored Ziegler's question regarding the status of the unions under the Workers' State. This question was evidently too hot to handle. Instead, he contented himself once more with concluding in a maze of quotations from Marx and Engels, apparently on the theory that if he read enough, he would so befuddle the audience that they would forget the barrenness of the theoretical position of the S.W.P. on the subject of the debate.

At the outset of his rebuttal, Ziegler tore to shreds Hudson's false concention that because De Leon believed in the possibility of a peaceful revolution in the U. S., he was opposed to revolution. Ziegler pointed out that by this process of Hudsonian illogic Marx and Engels would also have to be denounced as enemies of revolution since they also had believed and taught that a peaceful revolution was possible in England and in certain other countries. The attempt to link De Leon with the turncoat Kautsky was contemptuously dismissed as a piece of typical Trotskyist demagoguery to cover up their theoretical bankruptcy. The fact of the matter was that long before Kautsky openly embraced social patriotism, De Leon had repeatedly called attention to Kautsky's anti-Marxist tendencies.

Taking up the Trotskyist refrain that a Workers' State was necessary to suppress the counter-revolutionary activities of the "capitalist class" against the new Socialist society after capitalism had been destroyed, Ziegler pointed to their own Declaration of Principles which stated that: "In any society, the real power is held by those who own and control the means whereby society lives, the instruments of production, distribution and communication." Here was the explicit recognition that once the capitalists were deprived of this economic power they would be powerless and harmless to the new society. However, the Trotskyists were so intent upon performing the American revolution in Russian costumes and designs that they completely overlooked the logic of their own reasoning. In their eagerness to suppress a non-existent danger they forgot the A-B-C of Marxism that classes were a reflection of certain social and economic relationships existing in society and that once these specific relationships were destroyed, along with them were destroyed the class divisions which had arisen from them.

Ziegler showed that it was a senseless contradiction in terms to talk of the abolition of capitalism in one breath and at the same time presuppose the continued existence of the capitalist class as a social power. Since the social revolution would wipe out the capitalist social relationships, the class divisions of capitalist society would disappear along with these social relatiionships.

Replying to Hudson's contention that there was as much ground for the growth of a bureaucracy within an industrial union administration as in a political party, Ziegler pointed out that there was a world of difference between a vanguard political party which represented but a small fraction of the working masses and which proposed to set itself up over and above the masses and their organizations as a superior power, and an industrial union administration which would be composed of all the workers and whose representatives would be directly responsible to the membership and not to the Central Committee of some occult political party. The one would represent a bureaucratic State power; the other was a simple non-political administrative organ.

In place of a so-called Workers' State with its grave danger of bureaucratic degeneration, the Socialist Union Party presented the program of Socialist Industrial Unionism which would replace the present class political government based upon terrtorial constituencies with an Industrial Administration founded upon industrial constituencies and functioning through the integral industrial unions composed of ALL the productive workers in society.

AGAINST THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

Presentation by A. Ziegler, Nat. Secy., S.U.P.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Comrade Hudson, Fellow workers:

The issue for debate this afternoon, as the Chairman has stated to be, is: "Resolved, That a Workers' State is necessary to establish Socialism in the United States."

I have heard it stated by well-meaning workers that the question of a Workers' State is merely one of academic abstraction, of no practical importance to the workers in meeting the real issues confronting them . We consider such a view to be a serious blunder. Let me tell you why.

What is the greatest obstacle confronting the revolutionary movement here in America today? Is it not the degeneration of the Russian Workers' Government into a foul and criminal dictatorship over the Russian masses, and the consequent loss of faith among large numbers of workers in the very concept of Socialism itself? That has been my experience and I have traveled the length and breadth of this country. Wherever I went I experienced the same reaction among awakening and inquiring workers.

"What guarantee," they would ask, "have we that an American Socialist Government would not degenerate in the same manner as did the Russian Workers' Government?" This is a question that connot be ignored; the answer to it brings us to a consideration of the nature of the form of government which is to replace the political government of capitalism.

Before plunging into the subject matter proper, it is necessary to make one preliminary observation. It is elementary and accepted as a fundamental starting point by all Marxists that before we can begin the task of establishing Socialism, we must first uproot and destroy the entire capitalist State apparatus. For the purposes of the discussion this afternoon the issue as framed presupposes the preliminary destruction of this capitalist State machine. The concrete question before us is: With the capitalist State destroyed, what specific measures are necessary to assure the establishment of Socialism?

To this question my worthy opponent, representing the Socialist Workers Party, gives the answer:—the Workers' State. Since my opponent has failed to define the Workers' State specifically, I must now perform this task for him.

A Workers' State is defined in the following language in the Declaration of Principles of the Socialist Workers Party: "The Workers' State is a temporary political instrument making posible the transition to a classless society. Its task is to defend the workers' revolution against its enemies both within and without, and to lay the foundation for Socialism and the final elimination of classes and class rule."

The Declaration of Principles goes on to inform us that the specific form of the proposed Workers' State will be Soviets or in the nature of Workers' Councils and that "The leadership of the workers' revolutionary party is required to secure the defense of the Workers' State and to carry out the organization of Socialist economiy. The role of the revolutionary party as the leader of the class continues until all forms of class organization, including both the State and all political parties, have disappeared, giving way to the classless Socialist society."

Here we have implicit the idea that Socialism is not to be established immediately but society is first to undergo a transition period, during which class divisions continue to exist, and a Workers' State set up with the "revolutionary" party, presumably the Socialist Workers Party, playing the role of top dog within the government.

We of the Socialist Union Party categorically repudiate this proposed method of establishing Socialism here in the United States. We contend that the problem of establishing a classless Socialist society in the United States is not a matter for the future. Quite the contrary! Once the capitalist State is overthrown, Socialism can be immediately established here in

America without the intervention of a bureaucratic apparatus over the workers, as proposed by the Socialist Workers Party.

Mr. Chairman, we go further: We take the affirmative position that the establishment of a proposed Workers' State here in the United States would constitute a gross usurpation, a fatal distortion of Marxism which must inevitably lead to a dictatorship *over* the workers along the same pattern as the evil, corrupt Stalinist bureaucracy in Russia.

Now as to the proof.

We concede that the tactic of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, i.e., the Workers' State, has a certain limited historical validity in the Marxist movement. However, our position is that this particular tactic has long since become outmoded here in the United States by changed material economic conditions differing from those that prevailed in Marx's day. Today the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is not only unnecessary but positively harmful. The tactic of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat was the political expression of that economic backwardness that prevailed in Marx's day.

In 1848, when Marx and Engels published the "Communist Manifesto," nor yet in 1871 at the time of the Paris Commune, capitalist production had not fulfilled its historic mission of perfecting the industries to the high degree of productivity necessary to make available a material abundance for all members of society. Material abundance for all is the very basis of Socialism! Without that as a preliminary condition Socialism is impossible.

Marx as the tactician of the working class movement was confronted with this problem. While he had already succeeded in piercing the veil of mystery enveloping capitalist production and laying bare its innermost laws of motion, yet he could not proceed to the immediate introduction of a classless, non-political society. The requisite economic conditions were lacking. To bridge the gap between the insufficient productive facilities of his day and the fully-developed productive facilities of the future, Marx contrived the makeshift tactic of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, i.e., the Workers' State which he decribes as a political transition period to Socialism. Even as late as 1891, Engels in the revised edition of his "Origin of the Family" inferentially noted that conditions were not ripe for the immediate abolition of the State and classes precisely because of still insufficient economic development.

"We are now," he wrote, "approaching a stage of evolution in production in which the existence of classes has not only ceased to be a necessity, but becomes a positive fetter on production. Hence these classes must fall as inevitably as they once arose. The State must irrevocably fall with them."

Thus we see that the concept of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is not a basic principle of Marxism as our Trotskyites would lead us to believe, but a tactical makeshift made necessary by the insufficient economic production of Marx's day.

The great mistake our Trotskyites make is that they overlook the fact that Marxism

---

Taking the Profit Out of War. "French workers behind the lines have been ordered by the government to accept a smaller rate of pay for overtime than for the basic forty-hour week, in a move designed to prevent any class of the population from profiting from the war.

"Previous decrees set up a special system of taxation to keep employers from profiting from the war, and exacted war taxes from white-collar classes.

"The newest step in the government effort to equalize the war burden requires workers who labor overtime to receive only 60 per cent. of the normal hourly pay. The other 40 per cent. will go to the government war chest.

"Thus, a Paris worker who receives 12 francs (about 27 cents) an hour gets 480 francs (about $10.90) for a forty-hour week. But for ten extra hours he will receive only 72 francs (about $1.63), instead of 120 ($2.72). This is in addition to a special 15 per cent. war tax on normal income, which is applied to all men of military age. Other workers pay 4 per cent. instead of the basic pre-war 2 per cent. —A.P. cable from Paris, Nov. 2nd

---

is a dialectical historical science and not a dogma or a series of articles of faith to be learned by heart, and to be universally applied regardless of existing material and social conditions and their degree of development. Marxism differs from Catholicism. In the Roman Catholic Church the same rules of conduct apply to the devout located in the frozen Arctic, in the tropical wilderness, in backward China and Asia as to advanced social conditions in the United States. There is no distinction in application.

Our Trotskyites overlook the fact that the United States of 1940, economically, socially and culturally, is entirely different from the capitalism of Marx's day.

Here in the United States the gap between the historical mission of capitalist production, i.e., the perfecting of the means of production, and the backwardness of capitalism in fulfilling this task in Marx's day, has long since been bridged. There is no necessity for employing the makeshift tactic of the Workers' State. In fact any attempt to establish a Workers' State here can be nothing less than a usurpation because it would set up the rule of a minority political organization above the masses, without the slightest historical or economic justification.

But our Rip Van Winkle Trotskyites continue spouting the same old slogans of 1848 and 1871. Marx formulated the theory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat to meet limited historical conditions; ergo, it becomes a cardinal article of faith for our Trotskyists, never, never to be surrendered.

There remains one more count in our indictment against the Trotskyist pattern of a Workers' State, i.e., the question of bureaucracy.

In the first place it should be noted that this Workers' State of my opponent is really a misnomer. What he really means is a State controlled by a vanguard, minority political party, in which this party plays the leading role over all other agencies including the labor unions, just as in Russia under the regime of Lenin and Trotsky.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose to show that the attempt to foist a political party into the leading role in a proposed Workers' State means in actual practice the creation of a political bureaucracy over the workers. In Russia the Soviets, representing the broad masses, were ostensibly the organs of government under the Workers' State, but in reality the Soviets were controlled by the Communist Party. No less an authority than Leon Trotky has admitted this to be the real relationship between the Soviets and the party during the regime of Lenin and Trotsky.

During the hearing conducted by the Prelminary Commission of Inquiry held in Mexico City, Trotsky was asked by the attorney for the Commission, John Finerty, the precise relationship between the Commissars of the Soviet Government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The following colloquy ensued:

> *Trotsky*: "As I remember it every decision of the Central Committee [of the Communist Party] had for them [the Soviet Commissars] absolute authority."
>
> *Finerty*: "So in fact whether in theory or not the Party was supreme over the Commissars?"
>
> *Trotsky*: "Yes."

This is the pattern of the democratic Workers' State my opponent and his organization would introduce here in the United States.

Nowadays it is quite fashionable for Trotsky and his supporters of the Socialist Workers Party to tell us that the sinister force in the Russian Communist Party was at all times Stalin and that Trotsky was the bulwark for the protection of democratic rights in the Party. But history tells us a different story.

I have here in my hands a pamphlet entitled the "Workers Opposition in Russia" by A. Kolontay, an old time, pre-revolutionary Bolshevik. This is an extraordinarily important political document. Written in 1921 for submission to the 10th Congress of the Communist Party, it contains the program of the Workers' Opposition, a minority group within the Party composed of rank and file elements largely active in the trade unions. These workers banded together in opposition to the grow-

ing bureaucratic practices of the inner ruling circle of the Communist Party which were threatening to wipe out completely Party democracy. I wish I had the time to read you extracts from this most revealing political document. Suffice to say that it contains a blistering indictment of the officialdom of the Party headed by Lenin and Trotsky.

A number of concrete proposals were submitted as a means of rooting out the growing bureaucratic practices within the Party. Among these were the return to the election principle in place of the appointment system which had sprung up in the Party and the further requirement that all responsible officials be made answerable to the masses and not to the Central Committee of the Party as was the practice. A second proposal called for a restoration of the widest publicity within the Party in the discussion of matters of policy and the determination of such matters by the Party membership itself and not by the top officials behind the backs of the membership; also establishment of the freedom of opinion and expression, permitting not only the right to criticize freely during discussions but to use Party funds for the publication of literature proposed by different Party factions.

Surely this was a modest program, touching on the basic democratic rights of the membership. What was its fate? The Communist Party Congress under the direct influence of Lenin and Trotsky, proceeded to outlaw the Workers' Opposition, and punish its leading comrades by banishing them.

Here we have our vanguard party in operation. Fellow workers, is it not logical to believe that the same bureaucratic degeneration that set in the Russian Communist Party under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky (and not Stalin, mind you), would be repeated here in America were a Workers' State attempted to be set up? A political party which sets itself up as playing the leading role over and above the masses must inevitably degenerate into bureaucratic excesses.

While the concept of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat has, as we previously pointed out, a certain historical justification in the Marxist movement, the peculiar concept of the revolutionary party playing the "leading role" in such transition period has none whatsoever. It is purely a Leninist innovation, created out of the material conditions in which the Russian movement found itself. Neither Marx nor Engels ever taught or wrote on the "leading role" of *the* one revolutionary party.

And now, before concluding, I want to ask my opponent a simple question which I believe to be very relevant to the purpose of this debate. My question is: What role will the labor unions play under his proposed Workers' State? Is it not true that the unions and their mass membership will be subjected to the control and domination of this minority vanguard political party which is destined to play the leading role in his proposed Workers' State? I hope my opponent will see fit to answer this question.

A.F.L.-C.I.O. UNITY IN FIGHT AGAINST BOSSES

"Springfield, Ill., Nov. 24 - The Illinois United Mine Workers Union (C. I. O.) and the Progressive Mine Workers of America (A.F.L.), bitter rivals for seven years, joined hands today to support each other's efforts for better working conditions.

"The agreement between the district unions was reached last night at a conference over a dispute the P.M.W. is having with the Superior Coal Company of Gillespie, Ill. Ray Edmundson, State President of the U.M.W., pledged his union's support to the P. M.W. David Reed, president of District 6 of the P. M.W., accepted and promised similar co-operation to the U. M. W., if and when needed.

" 'The time has ended,' Reed said, 'when companies can play one labor organization against the other to their own advantage. From now on, what is one union's fight will be taken up by the other.' "—United Press dispatch to the *New York Post.*

That's the stuff. If we had nationwide unity of the workers against the bosses, we would soon have no bosses!

THE PAUPERIZATION OF AMERICA

ONLY YESTERDAY it was quite fashionable for President Roosevelt and his New Dealers to arouse support for their program of depression-killing nostrums by pointing out the deplorable condition of "one-third of a nation, ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed." But today, after the President's remedies have been tried for seven years, there is no voice raised to shout to the heavens that his remedies have failed, and that no longer one-third, but TWO-THIRDS of the nation receive less than enough income to meet their normal living expenses. Yet these are the facts, as reported by the New Deal's own official agencies!

Despite the present war boom, the great majority of the population have not been able to improve their living standards; on the contrary, as the figures show, the increase in production caused by the war has not been able to absorb more than a small percentage of the vast army of unemployed which has been walking the streets and besieging the relief offices for the past eleven years.

Illustrating the growing pauperization of the American workers, President Roosevelt's National Resources Planning Board has just released a 195 page study showing that the poorest third of the population subsists on an annual income of less than $780 per year per family and the next higher third of the population receive incomes running no higher than $1,450 per family unit.

Let us recall that, according to the Brookings Institute, even in 1929, supposedly capitalism's peak year, 42.4 per cent. of American families earned less than $1,500. (An average family is computed to comprise 4.1 members). Now we have a total of sixty-six and two-thirds per cent. of our population living on incomes of less than $1,500, or an increase of close to 25 per cent. since the crash of 1929.

In a supplementary report on "Consumer Expenditures in the United States," the National Resources Planning Board finds that in the years 1935 and 1936, the poorer two-thirds of the people did not earn or receive enough income to provide the barest necessities for existence and were compelled to mortgage their future earnings in order to provide for their daily bread. According to the report, the consumption expenditures of the lowest third exceeded their income by 17 per cent. Furthermore, a great proportion of the families and individuals in the American so-called "middle class" showed deficits which were met by expenditures from savings of former years, by loans from relatives and friends, by installment buying and other forms of borrowing.

It should be remembered that the arbitrary splitting of the population into three income groups also serves to hide the fact that in the so-called upper third, a good proportion only manages to receive just enough income on which to live, with a small margin for savings. Thus, an examination of the statistics shows that of the 13 million family units in the highest third of the nation, six million received an income of no more than $2,000, of which they spent more than 90 per cent. on living expenses.

As to the distribution of America's goods and services, the Planning Board found that the lowest two-thirds consume 42 per cent. while the highest one-third uses 58 per cent. Consumption of food per family ranges from $203 per year for those at the bottom of the income ladder to ten times that amount for those on top; medical care from $22 to $837 per year; recreation from $6 to $921; reading from $4 to $126.

In the old days, and not infrequently today, Socialists were denounced for allegedly desiring to divide up the wealth. However, we see here that capitalism has done a pretty good job of dividing already, with the capitalists getting the lion's share, and the workers getting the donkey's.

Those optimistic souls who never lose their faith in capitalism no matter how shabbily it treats them must have had at least the seed of doubt planted in their minds when they read the recent speech delivered by Secretary of Labor Perkins before the National Conference on Labor Legislation in Washington. Mrs. Perkins showed that while industrial production has once more reached, and in some in-

stances even exceeded, 1929 peak levels, re-employment has by no means kept pace, The Secretary of Labor estimated that only some 1,250,000 new industrial jobs have been created as a result of this new spurt. This still leaves more than 10 million workers unemployed, as compared with the normal unemployment level of two to three millions in 1929. Here the representative of the capitalist government has established as true what the Socialist Union Party and LABOR POWER have constantly been trying to hammer home: that we have in America a huge layer of disemployed workers who have been permanently eliminated from industry.

It is very instructive to note that Secretary Perkins, in accounting for the small percentage of re-employment with the return of capacity production, pointed to the more efficient machine processes and the greater productivity of labor as the chief reasons. In making this statement she has pointed unerringly to the real cause of this permanent army of unemployed. By its very nature capitalist industry, whose entire motive force is the quest for profits, must introduce greater and greater efficiency in the utilization of machine processes and an ever-increasing intensification of the productivity of labor so as to reduce labor costs and thereby increase profits. The inevitable result is continued and growing technological unemployment.

The growing pauperization of the American masses comes as no surprise to the revolutionary Socialist. More than 80 years ago, Karl Marx, the founder of the modern scientific Socialist movement, pointed out that such a tendency was inherent in the very nature of capitalist production. The reports of the National Resources Planning Board and the speech of Secretary Perkins cited above bear eloquent testimony to the validity of Marx's analyses and conclusions.

Yet social reformers and capitalist apologists of all breeds refuse to accept the conclusions to which their own investigations point. They wish to eliminate all of capitalism's social and economic evils and yet to preserve capitalism, the system whose laws of existence necessarily give rise to those evils.

Within capitalist production there is an irreconcilable conflict between production and consumption. In its unquenchable thirst for profits, capitalism constantly concentrates, improves and unifies the productive forces in fewer and fewer hands. This concentration carries in its wake the displacement of ever greater sections of the working class and the "middle class" from industry, and their elimination as consumers of all but the very barest of necessities.

In this process the capitalist class exercises no free will. It is compelled to bow to the dictates of inexorable economic law. The individual capitalist who would be tempted to pay his workers a higher than prevailing rate of wages with the intent of thus increasing consumption and thereby benefitting production would soon be driven into bankruptcy by his more "business-like" competitors, who would deprive him of his market by underselling him. Nor can the inexorable economic laws which compel the individual capitalists continually to improve their productive processes and cut their labor costs by increasing the productivity of labor be overcome or tampered with by legislative fiat. The colossal failure of the N.R.A. to regulate economic processes with the object of increasing purchasing power furnishes ample proof that laws cannot solve the problem.

As long as capitalist production is permitted to exist, the lot of the great masses of our population will continue to be increasing misery, poverty, degradation and insecurity, with fascist enslavement in the offing. There is only one solution for this social problem of the growing pauperization of the American people: the abolition of capitalism. No amount of tinkering of reforming of the system, nothing short of a thorough-going social revolution can meet the issue.

Workers, while there yet is time join with the Socialist Union Party in the struggle to throw off the chains of wage slavery and exploitation!

DON'T FORGET TO RENEW YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TO LABOR POWER.

A REPLY TO A STALIN APOLOGIST

Dear Comrade A:

The press of official business has prevented me from replying to your letter of November 8th heretofore.

In your letter you take exception to the position of the party on the Soviet-Nazi Pact as expressed in LABOR POWER

You prefer to view the recent excursion of Stalin into the field of Red Imperialism by way of Poland and the Baltic nations as a decided step forward for the cause of the International Proletarian Revolution. You almost become lyrical in your praise of the Red Army as a powerful force which can be set in motion to overthrow capitalism. You condone the Soviet-Nazi pact on the ground that "it was the part of wisdom for them (Soviet Bureaucracy) to use the rules of the game already set up by their enemies. It would be foolish not to." You draw these and similar conclusions from the basic premises that there is "no evidence or hint of evidence that a new leisure class living in luxury is developing in Russia," and consequently you refuse to accept the contra premise that the Russian Revolution has been betrayed.

Permit me to point out, Comrade, that the question whether or not the Russian Revolution has been betrayed by no means hinges on the further question whether a new leisure class has arisen in the Soviet. I can well grant your premise that a new leisure class has not arisen and at the same time maintain the position which is the position of the Socialist Union party that the Stalinist Bureaucracy has betrayed the Russian Workers' Revolution.

The real issue before us is WHO rules Russia to-day? Is the Soviet Government a democrtic expression of the workers or is it a political dictatorship *over* the workers? If it is established that the Russian workers have been deprived of basic democratic rights, and are subject to the bureaucratic rule of a dominant C. P. clique which brooks no political opposition regardless of its bona-fide character then there can be no question but that the revolution has been betrayed regardless of the fact whether or not a new economic class has arisen in Russia.

I take it that you will agree that there can be no Socialism or the pretence of Socialism without democratic rights for the toiling masses.

The Socialist Union Party bases itself upon the premises that the Russian workers are imprisoned in the autocratic grip of an evil, corrupt bureaucracy. This bureaucracy by its international policy, first of the Peoples Front, i.e. class collaboration with the Democratic Imperialits, and now by its line of "friendly cooperation" with the Nazi butchers of the International proletariat, has betrayed not only the Russian Revolution but the Internation Proletarian Revolution as well.

It is your privilege to disagree with this two-fold premise. However, if you do so, permit me to inquire how you can reconcile the manner in which the Soviet-Nazi pact was concluded with elementary democratic procedure. It can not be denied that the Soviet-Nazi Pact represented a fundamental, revolutionary change in the political policy of the country which vitally affected the working class. Yet, notwithstanding this, the pact was consummated entirely behind the backs of the Russian workers. The workers were never once consulted. The fact that such discussions were going on were kept a deep, dark secret. When an agreement was concluded the workers were presented with an "accomplished fact" all cut and dried which they were compelled to accept whether they liked it or not. I call your attention to the historic parallel of the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty, which involved the very life and death of the new revolution, but which nevertheless was subject to a broad democratic discussion pro and con before it was finally adopted.

It is because we of the Socialist Union Party view the Stalinist Bureaucracy as the inveterate betrayer of the International proletariat as well as the Russian workers. that we can not join with you in hailing the advent of Red Imperialism as a forward step.

Comrade, have you so soon forgotten

the treacherous policy of the Peoples Front that paralyzed the International Revolutionary movement, paved the road for the victory of Fascism in Spain and delivered the French working class tied hand and foot to the French Imperialists? Have you so easily forgotten the great betrayal of June, 1936 in France when the Communist Party at the behest of its master Stalin, closed the dikes of revolutionary sentiment and restored "order" for the quaking capitalist system? And, finally, what guaranty have you got that on the morrow Stalin will not return to this policy of class collaboration? One thing is certain: Stalin and his satellites have been far from recanting their dispicable tactics of class betrayal.

We are told by the Stalinists' apologists, including yourself, that the Soviet-Nazi Pact is to be justified, among other grounds, in that it serves to weaken the capitalist enemies of the Soviet by playing them off against each other. But in reality the Pact serves to strengthen one camp of Imperialist Bandits, i.e., the German Fascists, at the expense of the Allied Imperialist bandits.

It is well-known that Hitler's internal position in August 1939 was quite desperate. His only way out was a foreign adventure. Poland offered a tempting opportunity. But Hitler held back until he could assure himself of the benevolent neutrality of Stalin. He did dare to attack Poland before coming to an agreement with Russia to remain neutral, as otherwise he would be compelled to fight on two fronts and that would have been fatal. So Hitler set about winning the "benevolent neutrality" of Russia. As soon as a "friendly understanding" was reached with Stalin and the danger of fighting on two fronts obviated, Hitler invaded Poland and started the second Imperialist World War. Stalin thus assumes with Hitler joint responsibilty for commencing the Second Imperialist War in September 1939.

In this connection you ignore entirely the fact that the Soviet-Nazi Pact constituted a tremendous body blow to international working class solidarity. The spectacle of Hitler and Stalin cheek to cheek, establishing a "friendly understanding" between themselves for the division of Eastern Europe has served to seriously undermine proletarian class solidarity throughout the world. You will no doubt recall that in the early crucial days of the Bolshevik revolution, Lenin looked to the international solidarity of the proletariat as the strongest force fighton the side of the revolution.

Comrade, can you not see that what you call "strenghtening the Soviet regime," really amounts to bolstering up Hitler, the bloody Fascist butcher, and undermining the international proletarian movement?

One final question. Has it escaped you that Stalin and his American agent Browder are now openly exculpating German Fascism for its share of responsibility for the current imperialist slaughter and are placing all the blame on Allied Imperialism? To cap the climax these gentry are now acting as bell-wethers for German Fascism in an attempt to get the working class movement lined behind the Hitler-Nazi Imperialist peace aims.

Now, coming to the role of the Red Army:

Comrade, if you really think (as your letter seems to imply) that the world social revolution is a matter of Red Armies, then we have very little common ground for discussion on this head. Is it necessary for me to point out at this late date that the social revolution can not be a matter of importation but must grow out of the given material conditions at hand in the various countries? Once the working class of the various countries are ready for the revolution and properly organized, then the revolution comes as a matter of course and the intervention of the Red Army is totally unnecessary. The attempt to create revolutions behind the backs of the workers of a given country by means of invading Red Armies can have nothing in common with Marxism.

You make a final attempt to condone your support of the Soviet Bureaucracy by pointing "to the great social, cultural, scientific and general economic advances in the Soviet Union". But American Capitalism has made far greater social, cultural, scientific and general economic ad-

vances, than has the Soviet Union. Is that any reason for supporting the perpetuation of American Capitalism? Of course not. Well, neither are the undoubted economic and social advances of the Soviet Union any reason for exculpating the betrayal of the revolution by the Stalinist bureaucracy.

You say, Comrade, you are willing to let "time" judge as to who is right between us. But we can not permit ourselves this luxury. It is our duty since we set ourselves up as teachers of the working class to judge now. We can not remain neutral on the side lines. If we remain silent or adopt a policy of "benevolent neutrality" in the face of this undoubted betrayal of the Russian Revolution and the International proletariat, we are guilty of rendering aid and comfort to these arch betrayers.

Let me hear from you again.

Fraternally yours,
ABRAHAM ZIEGLER
National Secretary, S.U.P.

Nov. 24, 1939

ORGANIZATION NOTES

(*Continued from page* 2)

common front on the war danger. Seeing which way the wind was blowing, a fourth group withdrew on the ground that the previous withdrawal of the others had rendered the United Front ineffective. A fifth group informed the remaining two that it could render no material support in the form of physical or financial assistance. This left only the S.U.P. and one other organization, the Communist Workers Group. Recognizing that the desertion of the various component elements had left the United Front in a state of collapse, the delegates of the S.U.P. and the C.W.G. decided to suspend activity but to collaborate in the future whenever an occasion arises which makes this feasible.

Despite this disgusting experience, the Branch still feels that united front activity can be effective in carrying on a struggle affecting the workers generally, provided that mass organizations of workers, particularly the unions, can be brought into the united front.

BRANCH MINNEAPOLIS

The month of November was one of intensified activity for Branch Minneapolis, which is the present stopping place of the S.U.P. National Secretary, Comrade Abraham Ziegler.

The highlight of the Branch's activities was, of course, the debate between the S.U.P. and the Minneapolis Branch of the Socialist Workers Party on the question of the Workers' State. A complete report of this debate, which completely demolished the Trotskyist position, to the evident discomfiture of their local membership, appears elsewhere in this issue of LABOR POWER.

The Branch Study Class and Discussion Group has been meeting regularly on Tuesday evenings with Comrade Ziegler as instructor. This class is combining the study of Socialist theory with its practical application to every-day problems confronting the working class, and testing the validity and effectiveness of various social nostrums proposed to meet those problems.

A number of discussion meetings on important issues have already been held, including talks on "The Value of Labor Organization" and "The Co-operative Movement." The students and visitors to the class have taken an active part in these discussions. For Tuesday, December 5th, a symposium on the Farmer-Labor Party and its program of class collaboration and social reform has been arranged. The F.-L.P. has been invited to send a speaker and it is expected to be officially represented, thus enabling the students to obtain at first hand the Farmer-Labor program.

LOS ANGELES ACTIVITIES

After a period of silence, our Los Angeles comrades have just sent in a glowing report showing that their silence has not been caused by lack of activities.

A new and large permanent headquarters has been secured in the heart of the business district. It has been completely decorated by the labor of the members and will serve as a meeting place for lectures and study classes which will be conducted.

At a recent forum before the Young Zionist Labor League three speakers presented the position of the S.U.P. at the invitation of the League.

National Organizer William Briggs, who has just concluded his activities in Chicago, has been invited to make an extended stay in Los Angeles and he will aid the comrades there in their organizational work.

EDITORIALS

(*Continued from page 4*)

the question by voting a bond issue. In the towns and cities of New Jersey the requirements for applicants for relief are becoming more and more stringent as the cash grows smaller and smaller. In the state of New York the voters have for several successive elections voted in favor of referenda which authorized the issuance of new bonds for relief purposes. Meantime the debt of these governments is mounting, with no indication in sight as to where the end will be.

Even the Federal government, confronted with another unbalanced budget and a staggering national debt higher than ever before in its history, chose to cut down its relief expenditures, despite President Roosevelt's professed sympathy for the unemployed, in order that more appropriations for "defense" might be obtained. Since July 1st of this year more than a million W.P.A. workers out of a total of 3 million have been fired. Those remaining at work have received drastic cuts in salary. And the end is not yet.

Let no worker deceive himself that Cleveland is only an accidental phenomenon. Capitalism in the United States is in a permanent crisis from which it can never emerge no matter how it tries. Breakdowns and vicious curtailments in relief may be expected as the rule and not the exception. Cleveland's breakdown was spectacular and received lots of publicity. Those to follow will be kept quiet, if the politicians have their way, but the workers will starve just as painfully. The outlook for the unemployed is less and less relief until starvation will be not merely an agitator's phrase but a stark reality for millions.

2. Upon whom can the unemployed depend in this crisis? In Cleveland, the Mayor and the local politicians were powerless to act. The State administration, in the hands of reactionaries, refused to act. Yet even if the supporters of President Roosevelt were in power, the best they could do would be to relieve Cleveland's distress momentarily as Roosevelt himself is doing from outside the state. The money is not available to do more than that because the capitalist class in Ohio, just as everywhere else in the United States, is clamoring for reduction of budgets and taxes. Politicians are ever subservient to the ruling class from whom they receive their pay checks. Just as Roosevelt was compelled to retrench on relief nationally, so a New Deal state administration would also be compelled to cut Ohio relief.

The answer is that the unemployed can only depend on themselves and their fellow workers who happen to be employed for action in their own behalf. And the saddest part of the entire Cleveland crisis is the fact that outside of a few sporadic demonstrations which soon petered out, no organized struggle of the unemployed was waged to show to Ohio's ruling class the determination of those on relief not to submit tamely to starvation while Capitalism's profits are rolling in.

An awakened and militant relief organization, based on the solidarity of all workers, can carry on a battle which will make the capitalist class think twice before it decides to abolish relief or even to cut it down. It is true that such an organization cannot prevent the disentegration and bankruptcy of capitalism; it can, however act as a brake on the attempts of the ruling class to make the unemployed absorb the brunt of capitalism's woes.

For any final solution of the problems of the unemployed, they must, as we have ceaselessly repeated, act with their fellow workers to overthrow and abolish this system of production for profit, which is the cause of their plight. They must replace it with the Socialist Republic of Labor in which for the first time in man's history, the majority will rule in the interests of the majority.

WARNING! DANGER AHEAD!

The Business Manager of LABOR POWER is seriously contemplating abdicating his post. The reason? Month after month we have been appealing for a minimum amount of financial support to guarantee the continued appearance of LABOR POWER. But apparently our appeals have not registered in the minds of our readers for they have gone unheeded for the most part. *Now the continued publication of* LABOR POWER *is seriously endangered!*

We have repeatedly warned that the imminence of war and the growing fascist menace threaten to cut short, ere long, the legal existence of the entire revolutionary press. But now it appears that it is not the class enemy who is our most immediate and pressing danger, but rather the INDIFFERENCE of our own readers and friends. Hence our serious thoughts of abdicating. Perhaps we, too, are at fault; perhaps we were too easy-going; perhaps we have failed to drive home with sufficient emphasis the indispensable need for co-operation on the part of our readers and friends in building the circulation and supporting the finances of LABOR POWER.

Be that as it may, we are making another effort. It may be that because our editorial masthead carries the legend, "Composed and Printed by Voluntary Labor," some of our readers may have been deceived into believing that we have reached the happy stage where we are entirely freed from financial worries. That is far from the case. We still have to buy paper, which is no inconsiderable item, especially now with rising costs. We still have to buy and meet the overhead of a printing plant. Finally, there is the substantial postage bill for mailing LABOR POWER to all parts of the country. Until the money is available for these "raw materials" we cannot produce this magazine, no matter how much voluntary labor we have available.

In placing our cards on the table, we have no apologies to make. A revolutionary journal which could enjoy smooth and uninterrupted financial sailing under the material conditions of capitalism would rightly be suspect. There is not, never has been, and never will be such a journal. But the trouble is that our readers and friends are permitting this expected financial embarassment to be carried a bit too far.

Whether LABOR POWER is to continue to appear now rests with you. You must be the judge and jury. If you believe that LABOR POWER serves a useful function in helping the workers carry on the class struggle and in preparing for their emancipation, if you feel that its disappearance will be a distinct loss, then you must now express this belief in the concrete form of *subscriptions, paid bundle orders and, most important, financial contributions!* Nothing else will suffice.

All together, now, fellow workers; let's make it a "Happy New Year" for LABOR POWER.

—The Business Manager.

Send orders and remittances to BUSINESS MANAGER, "LABOR POWER," P. O. Box No. 4, Station T, New York, N. Y.